

# THE SOUTH:

13

A LETTER

FROM

A FRIEND IN THE NORTH.

*(Stephen Colwell, Esq.)* 1860-

WITH

SPECIAL REFERENCE

TO THE EFFECTS OF

DISUNION UPON SLAVERY. - U.S.

*Original in the possession of*

---

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY C. SHERMAN & SON.

1856.

12

## THE SOUTH.

---

A NATIVE of Virginia, long resident in Pennsylvania, I have for nearly thirty years been an attentive listener to the various discussions which have arisen between the South and the North. The class to which I belong is perhaps better able to keep balanced minds on some of those exciting topics than those who are more immediately engaged — better than natives of the North or residents of the South. It seems to me much more rare too for the natives of the South, to lose their sympathies with the place of their birth, than for those who go from the North to reside in the South. I feel quite sure that I have not lost my capacity, nor my disposition to weigh calmly, all the questions which pertain to Southern interests or institutions. I send you the gathered thought of some twenty years on the relations of South and North, as they apply to what seems to be the present condition of these controversies. I send them to you, not as argument nor as information, but as suggestions.

The subject of Slavery is of course the main topic. I can well remember the feeling of indignation and sorrow with which I beheld the rising cloud of Abolitionism. When no larger than a man's hand, it had a look of mischief, which its history has more than

verified. It has more sins to answer for than any excitement which has yet prevailed in this country. It found the whole people of the United States opposed to slavery. It was rare to find an intelligent man in all the Southern States, whose sentiments on the subject of slavery differed from those of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison. Now, thousands upon thousands profess to be the advocates of the institution for its own social value, and the whole South is said to be arrayed as one man in its defence, upon its own merits. But this is not all. The rabid fanatics of the North have goaded the South until they have roused a class of fanatics there, not less mischievous nor less disposed to assume dangerous responsibilities than those of the North. The reciprocal action of these two classes of fanatics, with passions far outweighing their judgments, has now produced a state of things fraught with no little danger to the whole country. While Northern fanaticism chiefly claimed our attention, I thought nothing of the kind could be more revolting and detestable; but I confess to a change of mind; for the fanaticism of the South has outdone that of the North. The Northern lights may well retire from the contest, for they have conjured up a spirit which threatens to accomplish their worst aims more rapidly than any efforts of theirs. They have apparently succeeded in bringing on that madness which precedes destruction.

I do not doubt that in the order of Providence Slavery is a path from savage to civilized life. The history of the world abounds in proofs of this. In the dawn of history, the masses were slaves. It was so at the advent of Christianity; no progress had

then been made in emancipation. Christianity recognised the relation, and pointed out the duties of both master and slave. It did not assail the relation, it did not rudely and instantly sever it, but it certainly did lay very heavy responsibilities upon the conscience of the master. It required him to do for his slaves all that was in his power; to train them to industry, to habits of labor, to skill in husbandry, and other arts of life; to make them willing and to fit them for eating their bread in the sweat of their brows; to rescue them from savage life, to civilize and Christianize them, and to do this as soon as practicable, whether it required one or more generations of time. The master is the patriarch of his people — they are his children; he is their guardian; they his wards. The question of emancipation must undoubtedly arise soon or late, and be studied in the light of the best interests of both parties. The slave on his part must pay for this care and guardianship; he must pay for his lessons and habits of industry; he must pay for his advancement to civilization: for the savage or the mere denizen of the forest or wilds of nature, can never be trained to industry and civilization but under some degree of compulsion. Seldom have any emerged from this condition but under the power of discipline. Whether the children of Africa are better as they were, or as they are in this country, it is not difficult to decide, even as things now are; but if the masters in this country were doing their whole duty, who but an abolitionist would not desire to see every uncivilized African in such bondage? Who can deny that American slaves are in a condition immeasurably better than the natives

of Africa, who murder and enslave each other without mercy and without a particle of advantage? The native Africans around Liberia, look upon the citizens of that republic as a superior order of beings.

Emancipation is a question which belongs to the master: he is made the judge, and on him rests the responsibility. It is a serious question. The slaves are neither to be retained too long, nor turned adrift too soon. He is bound to prepare them for freedom, for usefulness, for all the duties of civilized life. He must not emancipate them to make their condition worse, no more than a parent may send his children into the world without due training and preparation. Under the influences of Christianity, but without comprehending its true spirit, which requires more of the master than emancipation, vast numbers of slaves were unwisely, because prematurely, emancipated during the first three or four centuries of Christianity. The multitudes thus unhappily turned adrift in masses, fell below the condition of slavery, and the disadvantage followed their descendants for ages; in the opinion of some, it still follows them. It is well known, that the wholesale and indiscreet emancipations from feudal bondage, which took place in the reign of Henry VIII., landed those bondmen in irrecoverable pauperism. It is stated by some authorities, that 72,000 were hung in the reign of that monarch; hundreds of thousands of them became hopeless vagabonds. Their condition in the reign of Elizabeth, gave origin to the first act in the system of the compulsory poor-laws of England — a code in many of its features more, far more revolting in its spirit and tendencies than our system of slavery; a

code which long subsequently gave birth to Malthus's theory of population, an idea far more unchristian than had ever found favor among the holders of slaves in a Christian land. Emancipation is indeed a serious question; for upon its decision hangs the welfare of the man and his descendants for many, many generations. The ownership of slaves is a grave position, involving a guardianship of the highest order. No man would venture upon it who realized its duties. He upon whom Providence has placed it, may not rashly, nor unwisely, nor to the injury of his slaves, cast it off, either by sale, or by desertion, or by emancipation. He must do his whole duty to those who are placed in his charge. The power of the master is intended for the good of the slave, and the responsibilities are proportioned to his opportunities of doing them good. No despot or ruler has more power for the benefit of his subjects, than the master for the good of his slaves. The position demands the high qualities of firmness, intelligence, wisdom, patience, and kindness. It is a noble position when these qualities are brought to the discharge of its duties. What one master is bound to do, all are bound to do; and in this we see the mission of the masters in the United States. They have the training, education, and civilization of three or four millions of Africans on their hands; and, however short they may have fallen of performing their duties, it must be admitted, that very few masters in modern times have fulfilled them better. Let the slaves of the United States be compared with those of any other land. Compare them with the freedmen of Jamaica, or the masses of St. Domingo.

We do not believe that so many millions of slaves in as low a condition at the beginning, were ever before so rapidly advanced towards civilization and self-dependence. I believe, however, that this great and good work might, by a wiser management and a more full realization of duty on the part of masters, have been at least one generation more advanced than it is. In less than one hundred years, under proper treatment, the whole slave population might be made to deserve — to earn their freedom, and be placed in a respectable state of civilization, refinement, and education, so as to maintain a fair position in our Republic or any other. That depends on the masters now and hereafter, and perhaps on their being permitted to discharge their own duties unmolested by those who in this matter neither acknowledge the ways of Providence, nor appreciate the duties of a master.

The holders of slaves in the United States, have labored under many peculiar disadvantages in an economical point of view. They have complained bitterly of many things for some scores of years. It is evident they have been ill at ease. I think they early mistook the nature of their troubles. There have been peculiar events in the progress of American slavery, some of which require to be appreciated to understand its present condition. One of these is its extraordinary dispersion over an immense extent of territory — a diffusion not itself the result of design, but a direct consequence of the purchase of Louisiana. The fertile lands of that great region attracted immediately a very large emigration of the holders of slaves who had worn out their lands in Virginia,

in the Carolinas, and Georgia. This emigration of masters and slaves, continuing as it did without abatement for many years, produced memorable results. An immense quantity of land was thrown upon the market in those States. This was especially the case in Virginia and South Carolina. Improved lands fell there to a third, fourth, or fifth of their former value. Many of the rich proprietors, not anticipating this depreciation, were impoverished by purchasing lands constantly falling in value. But they found to their cost, that their thousands of acres were soon of little more value than hundreds had been. Surely this was a heavy misfortune, a destruction of wealth which could not but be felt deeply and widely. The men who emigrated did well, those who remained suffered. One compensation they had — the price of slaves was doubled, and a great demand ensued. But for this, universal, unmitigated ruin would have fallen upon the old States, or entire emigration would have become a necessity. I do not believe, however, that the increased value of the slaves ever reached half the amount of the depreciation of the lands.

All this, however injurious to the masters and to the States of Virginia and the Carolinas, was a benefit to the slave and to the country at large. The more diffused the slave population, the better for the slave. Compare the slaves of Kentucky and Maryland with those of Louisiana and South Carolina. This rise in the value of slaves, was regarded as a boon and set-off to the loss on the land. It gave a great impulse, however, to the internal slave trade; it divided the slave families and hardened the hearts of the masters, who were unfortunately placed in the position of



having no other property so saleable as slaves. No doubt the result of this state of things, continued for years, had unhappy consequences both on masters and slaves; the latter being more regarded merely in the light of property, and less entitled to those higher cares and attentions which no slave-owner can neglect without guilt. Too many became mere breeders of slaves for distant markets. Whilst diffusion had its benefits for those slaves who were carried away, it had its evils for those who remained. The sale of slaves drew off the attention of masters in a considerable degree from those departments of industry suitable for slaves — a dereliction injurious alike to slave and master.

The social and industrial economy of these States was by this whole operation exceedingly deranged. A large portion of the white population suffered severely, and large quantities of improved lands went back to a state of nature. It is probable that, in a national point of view, the increased value of new lands has more than compensated for the loss on the old; but revolutions in value, if rapid like these, are disasters of no small magnitude. For these troubles the North is in no degree accountable.

The North is not accountable for the loss which follows that wasteful system of agriculture which is almost universally pursued at the South, of exhausting the land as rapidly as possible. This improvidence is that of the spendthrift using his capital instead of his income. It is a serious economical evil, and has inflicted much injury upon the master and slave. The slave is thus trained in a bad school. The master, not sufficiently enlightened to under-

stand his own interests, can never do justice to his slaves. The labor of slaves thrown away, or not well directed, is an injustice to the slave who is serving his master to earn freedom and civilization for himself. The product of English agriculture has doubled in thirty years; that of nearly the whole continent of Europe is improving. The owners of our slaves are bound by these important considerations, to keep even with the foremost in agricultural improvement; it is a sacred duty which they owe to their slaves.

The masters have committed a great industrial mistake, in devoting themselves too exclusively to special staples. Tobacco, cotton, rice, sugar—to one or the other of these, they have generally devoted all their minds and all their labor. This has proved equally injurious to the planter and his people. It has ruined the land and kept down its value; it has not awakened the minds nor improved the manual skill of the slave; it tends to a nomadic state of agriculture, in which the lands never long maintain any great value. It should be the aim of the planter, while he makes what annual profit he can from his land, to build up a valuable estate, which, in the end, from its continued if not increased productiveness, will be not merely a more valuable bequest to children, but a permanent property in the community, and a permanent home for a colony of slaves, who, upon its improved soil and with its accumulated advantages, may the more rapidly and certainly make advances in civilization, which are impossible with the continual movement and the hard labor incident to an incessant attack upon fresh lands. This is not incon-

sistent with the idea that diffusion of slaves is for their advantage: diffusion is a benefit, but not constant movement. The more masters the better; but the more changes the worse. The exclusive devotion to special staples has scarcely one compensating advantage. The true idea of a plantation is an industrial colony under one head, on which as many branches of industry are concentrated as possible. It should be self-supporting as far as practicable. The present interest of the slaves requires this, and the ultimate interest of the master demands it not less. No single article can be grown by a whole district with such advantage as to purchase all others by its sale. Where land can find consumers close at hand for all its products, there it is the most valuable. It is so in the vicinity of every large city. Land produces abundance of food that will not bear transportation; these, its heaviest products, afford the largest profit to the farmer. The planter has this advantage in a high degree. He should not only feed, but to a great extent manufacture the clothing of his people from the products of his land. This implies a considerable reduction in the crop of the great staples; but not by any means a reduction in the amount received for them. The planters have committed the mistake of constantly overstocking the market. They have planted cotton on the best terms for Great Britain, by keeping such a stock of cotton in her markets as gave the purchaser the whole power over the price.

The loss to American slave labor which this false policy has produced is incredible. It is probably not less than from one-third to one-half the annual cost

of maintaining each slave; it has not been less than from ten to twenty millions yearly. This is in addition to a heavy loss incurred in the depreciation of lands by this wretched system. Under a proper course of cultivation, by rotation and home manufacture by the slaves, plantations would increase rapidly in value; and lands cultivated by slaves would be worth on the average two or three times what they can be sold for at present. This system, too, has not only been an injury to the master, but an immense injustice to his slaves, by retarding their progress and their ultimate freedom many generations. Great Britain has made paupers of her millions, for the purpose of underselling other manufacturers in all the markets of the world. Our planters have encouraged her in this false policy by furnishing cotton at her own price, not only to their own pecuniary disadvantage, but to the injury of millions of their people thus delayed in their progress to civilization and liberty. I use these terms without hesitation, because I have not the least doubt that the wiser and the better adjusted the industrial system of the South, the more rapidly will the Africans be prepared for freedom, and the more willingly will their masters set them free. In a well-arranged system of slave labor they would improve so rapidly, pay for their freedom so easily, and become fitted to enjoy it so quickly, that emancipation would come as fast, if not faster, than the wisest heads could prepare for it.

Whatever be the value of free trade as a theory or department of political economy, I could never understand, with my knowledge of the subject, how

it came so much in favor with Southern politicians. I can understand why England favors it; but our planters, it seems to me, ought to be very shy of it. There is in my view but one sound or endurable defence of Slavery — that it is for the good of the slave. On that ground only can Slavery be endured in any part of Christendom for the time to come. Slavery is a special intervention of society in reference to a particular class for their best interests. It takes the savage, it takes his labor, his personal liberty; it clothes him, feeds him, takes care of his health; in fact it descends to the minutest particulars in the direction and management of the individual man. This is a wholesale violation of the principle, "*Laissez faire, laissez passer*," which dictates that in what concerns labor and trade and personal dealing men are the best judges of their own interests, and must be left to themselves. There are three millions in this country to whom the supposed benefits of free trade are utterly denied. The free-trade men of Europe are, in consistency with their theory, strong abolitionists. When the commercial interests of England arrived at that state in which she found it her policy to become the apostle and pretended exemplar of free trade, she at once, for the sake of consistency, washed her hands of Slavery. The doctrine of the theory which is opposed to free trade is, that in all circumstances, and every where, the interests of laborers, individually and as a mass, should be *specially studied and specially promoted*. This is consistent with the true theory of Slavery. This doctrine finds in our country thrice as many poor white laborers who depend upon their daily toil

for their daily bread, and it holds that their labor, being all that they have, should above all things be the subject of special legislation and social care. The time is coming when the holders of slaves will find the logic of free trade wielded against them with a mighty power, which will derive additional force from their admissions. I am familiar enough with the free-trade literature of England and the continent to know that it is utterly opposed to Slavery, and in fact, if the premises of that theory be admitted, its logic must soon level every defence of Slavery.

It has always struck me as strange that the South should patronise a theory which would, if universally adopted, destroy the growing cotton manufactories of France, of Germany, of Belgium, and Russia, as well as those at home, and thus leave the whole of the cotton to find its market in England at the prices dictated there. To prefer one bidder to five or six for such a commodity, betrays an ignorance of commercial matters of which only an agricultural community could be guilty. If the whole influence and example of the United States had been exerted for the diffusion of manufacturing industry throughout the world, there would now be half a dozen effective bidders among the nations for cotton. Now, England fixes the price; then, the planters would have fixed their own rates.

My apprehension that the free-trade theory is not the true policy of the South is as strong as this: I have long believed that one of the most serious evils under which the Southern States were laboring was *free trade with the Northern States*. This is indirectly

admitted by Southern politicians and men of business. Witness their commercial conventions, the object of which is independence of the Northern States in trade and industry. These conventions are a struggle in behalf of their own industry; they are a war of the good sense and necessities of the people against their theory of free trade. It is amusing to observe the workings of this inconsistency, where all the speeches are in favor of free trade, where all the action is against it. These Southern movements spring from a real evil — free trade with the North — and demand rightly some remedy or alleviation. A complete remedy is attainable — but might involve the sacrifice of free-trade theories, to the substantial material interests of the people of the Southern States. In my view of Slavery, that which is a material benefit to the master is so also to the slave. Whatever greatly promotes the true interests of the proprietors of land and slaves enables them to improve their modes of cultivation, to introduce new branches of industry among their people, to provide better for their comfort, health, and proper education. The planter who is barely able to sustain himself can never do justice to his people. The friends of the African should ever be ready for his sake to unite in promoting the true industrial interests of the South. It is really far less difficult now to adjust the commercial and industrial interests of South and North by compromise than it ever was, or is now to adjust their political interests. It can only be done, however, in the one case as it was in the other, under an abiding and strong feeling of the value of the Union.

That this free trade with the Southern States has been of immense advantage to Northern industry cannot be doubted. It has gone far to compensate the injuries it has suffered in the trade with England. The South buys from the North to the full amount of its whole industry. It has always purchased more than its crops paid for, and there is a great unpaid balance due from Southern merchants to Northern merchants. The country which buys every thing and sells one or two commodities must always suffer by free trade; it pays too many profits and too much freight, and its soil is but half employed. Free-trade with England is as great an evil for the South as free trade with the North. It is a varied industry which the South wants. It cannot be had, however, under free trade with England any more than under free trade with the North.

The approximations already made to free trade in the United States have probably inflicted on the industry of this country a greater destruction of capital than would compensate the South five times over for all the depreciation of her lands. The South has at times imagined that what was an injury to the North must be their benefit. It is not so. The industrial power of the country may be so combined as to produce combined advantage; and no great interest can suffer without its being reflected and visited upon others. The North has had great benefit from free trade with the South, but the North has suffered not a little from the evils inflicted on the South by free trade, and that unpaid debt is a part of the suffering. So England pursues her foreign trade with a terrible infatuation; forcing her goods



into all corners of the earth, and every few years sustaining immense losses by those who cannot or will not pay. England's true policy is to increase her market at home. If she would add but \$20 per head to the consumption of fifteen millions of her people, which they need to make them as comfortable as our slaves, she would have an additional market of \$300,000,000, a sum equal to two-thirds of her whole foreign trade. At least one-fourth of the sum would be for cotton for her own people, who need it. When England ceases to manufacture for the world at the lowest prices, she can inaugurate the policy of adequately supplying her own people. The increased prices of her exports will enable her to purchase all her raw materials. England has certainly lost by her policy of manufacturing cheap goods and sending them over the world for sale upon long credit, more, far more, than would now discharge her national debt. She has lost on the price, and she has lost on her credits; her people have suffered for want of that which was carried away and lost abroad; and this policy has been pursued for centuries. Yet merchant princes have flourished, and so have princely manufacturers. The whole loss has fallen upon the English masses. The laborers are slaves to this system, which has begotten an aristocracy of masters, who are not responsible for the health, food, clothing, or moral training of the slaves upon whose labors they grow rich.

I desire to see our African slaves trained to civilization and comfort under a better system—a system which regards not trade merely, but industry; and not production merely, but the laborer; a system

which will bring back to the producers, their masters or employers, a full and fair return for all their labor. The labor of the man, whether slave or free, should be rated at what will sustain him comfortably with his family and educate his children. The free man's wages would be applied by himself; the slave's by his master, under all the responsibilities which bear upon the relation. And that national policy should be pursued which would tend to bring industry to this wholesome condition. Let the South, then, take care of Southern industry and make it effective by making it varied; let the policy of living upon one staple be abandoned, and let every plantation become in time an independent colony of intelligent laborers. As the Southern States cannot achieve their industrial independence by restrictive commercial regulations, their own Legislatures must find other legal modes of attaining the end; and in that object, properly pursued, they should be aided, not thwarted. They may confer important favors on the Northern States and secure adequate compensation in return.

If the men of the South, in their Legislatures and out of them, had expended but half the mind, half the labor, and half the money they have expended on their theory of free trade, in widening the basis of their industry, varying its branches, and in protecting it from Northern and foreign invasion, the South would this day be five times richer than it is, and ten times more contented.

In the face of such considerations as these, however, a cry for the separation of the States is now coming up from various parts of the South. It has

been so before, but it strikes me as rather more portentous than in times past. It is a striking fact that the only two classes in the United States who are in favor of disunion are the fanatical abolitionists of the North, and the fanatical anti-abolitionists in the South. The numbers North or South actually in favor of disunion are really insignificant. The fanatical abolitionist hates the Constitution of the United States because it recognises slavery, and is its protector; he hates the Bible for the same reason. For him there is no enormity under the sun like slavery, and there is no price he would not pay for its abolition, even to the lives and peace and happiness of both masters and slaves. But the cry from the South, from what motive does it come? It has come in past times and still comes in a large degree from those who only use it for political ends and to gain concessions from the North to those who profess to be suffering so immensely from the disadvantages of the Union. Of course this kind of talk must be very loud and apparently very earnest to attain its object. It must be supported by some show of reason and logic. This game has been played long and often with success. It has had the effect, however, of creating a spirit of dissatisfaction, and of persuading many of the less intelligent that the injuries inflicted upon the South by the Union are much greater than they are, and to make some of them actual advocates of disunion. It is probable that this has taken place to some extent, but clearly not to the extent supposed by those who are so loud in their cry of disunion. The majority of the Southern people are willing that this cry may be used for political effect,

though at heart as sound patriots as any in the nation.

There are doubtless some in the South who correspond in their fanaticism to the extreme abolitionists of the North, and who, viewing slavery, unending slavery, as the true and proper appendage of every social system, regard the Constitution with dislike because it forms a union with people who do not hold slaves and who do not appreciate the advantages of the system. The wisdom of these men is precisely of the same stamp as that of the fanatical abolitionists. Their minds are of the same order, and if their places were changed their doctrines would be changed. . However great the noise they make—for that is one of their joint characteristics—their number is not only small, but, what is more important, their influence not great. They are known to be men of more imagination than judgment; if they are sometimes eloquent, they are never competent advisers and safe guides.

But, however powerless to effect a disruption of the Union these fanatical parties may be, there is danger in the cry. It corrupts the minds of the young, and tends to extinguish patriotism and the sentiment of nationality in the heart of the youth of the country. *It is moral treason*; it is resistance to the implied oath of allegiance. No truly sound and thoughtful man can be guilty of it. But this project of disunion deserves more full consideration coming from the South.

To me no folly—nay, let me say no stupidity—ever appeared so great as this cry of disunion in the South, and especially when slavery is made the occa-

sion. In my view, and not in mine alone, the Constitution of the United States is at this moment the mightiest bulwark of slavery now existing in the world. The institution has been crumbling to atoms throughout all Christendom for the last half century. Under the Constitution of the United States alone does it flourish beyond the reach of harm. It is woven into our political institutions, and cannot be separated from them without breaking up the Union. The North, under our present Constitution, is bound to accept slavery as it is, and to protect it. The North cannot escape this obligation, and, let me say, does not desire to escape it, at the expense of the Union and all the evils to bond and free, North and South, which must follow the disruption. The mass of the people North are and will be faithful to their country as it is, with all its past compromises and in all its present trials. So I trust, also, is the mass of the people in the South. My object is to warn the latter that the subject is the last one that should be lightly handled by holders of slaves.

The people of Christendom out of the United States are, almost without exception, opposed to slavery: the whole literature of books and journals, civil and religious, is unanimous against slavery as it exists in the United States. The sentiment of modern civilization is against it. It is regarded with special abhorrence in Great Britain—we do not say with how much consistency, in view of a population of many millions ground down by the mercantile system of that country below the condition of slavery—but with an abhorrence virulent in proportion to their own sins against humanity. This abhorrence

of American slavery pervades the whole governing population of Great Britain. The truth of this assertion is familiar to all who have travelled in Great Britain and all who are familiar with her modern literature. Yet to this land—where enmity to American slavery is so prevalent—where it is difficult for an American who never owned a slave and never was in a slave State, to travel without being insulted on the subject of slavery, and without hearing our Northern States denounced as abettors of slavery—do some of the Southern orators and writers who favor disunion look for countenance and aid when the day of separation comes and civil war begins. The folly involved in this idea is quite consistent with that of dissolving the Union for the benefit of slavery. It is not at all improbable that men in high official position, both in England and on the continent, have been sounded upon this subject by some of the zealots of disunion. An intimation from a friend recently in Europe makes it indeed more than probable; one of the crowned heads of the continent having recently said, as if speaking from special knowledge, that our Union would not last beyond six years more. This information was doubtless derived from one of those busy pests of society found in every country, who are traitors in heart to all its best interests. If any Southern fanatic has been officious enough or fool enough to sound the Courts of Europe with a view to ascertain their views upon the subject of disunion and to propitiate them upon that scheme, he has no doubt been preciously duped. They would encourage the treason no doubt, while they contemned the traitor. It is un-

happily too true that our great Republic is unpopular in Europe. Our advance in population, power, and wealth, as well as in naval and military prowess, would, without any abuse of these advantages, have been sufficient to arouse the jealousy of monarchical Governments; but our recent absorption of Texas, our attack on Mexico, our demonstrations, piratical and diplomatic, upon Cuba, our inordinate appetite for annexation, have caused our country recently to be regarded with a strong dislike, not unmingled with alarm.

The powers of Europe look upon us as a great fighting bully, boasting of wealth and strength in everybody's face, and laying his club lustily around him without discretion or much care who suffers. They look upon such a character as one who deserves to be humbled and punished. They are all in favor of *dismembering him*. If the country shall be willing to dismember itself, and thus remove one of the foes they most fear, great will be their self-gratulation. They would gladly be saved the task of humbling the haughty Republicans—a task which might involve their suffering some portion of the humiliation they designed for us. No prospect could be more pleasing to the potentates of Europe than the disunion of this country. There can be no reasonable doubt of that. Would they, in that event, be any more our friends than they are now? Would the people of Great Britain, or those of the continent, be any more the friends of slavery than now? No: they would exult and say, Slavery is now doomed; it has lost its great shield—the Constitution of the United States. If disunion were followed by civil war, as would be inevitable, the

Governments of Europe would gladly see us wasting that strength on each other which they feared might be some day exerted against them or their projects. They would take no part in a contest in which they could not reasonably expect to reap any solid advantage. They would allow us to fight it out, because we should be doing their work without any cost of blood or treasure to them.

‘But the cotton! the cotton! You do not take into the account that Great Britain must have our cotton.’ It is very true that one of the elements of diplomacy and battle in that struggle would be cotton; but its importance is over-estimated by the South, if it supposes that it could dictate terms of peace or secure any desired advantage upon the strength of its cotton bales. Great Britain sacrificed more than the full value of all her cotton factories in her wars with France and Napoleon, and she is now engaged in a contest which may cost as much, to preserve the balance of power in Europe. She might estimate the advantage to her own cotton-growing dominions as more than equal to the disadvantage she would suffer by being, for a time, deprived of any supply of cotton from our Southern States. She might say: “This privation, and the high price of cotton, will stimulate its culture in every climate and soil suitable for it. Instead of relying, as heretofore, mainly on one country and slave labor for cotton, we may look for it hereafter to a score of countries. Our linen manufacture will, in the mean time, flourish as it deserves to do, and when the struggle is over we shall be more the masters of the commercial and manufacturing world than ever.” France must soon



receive her supplies from Algiers. No country would have any advantage over another in regard to the short supply of cotton.

But even if the English Government were disposed to protect the Southern States and their slaves for the sake of their supply of cotton, it would rouse by such an attempt all the strength and fury of British abolitionism—a power potent enough to hurl from its place any Ministry which should become the avowed patron and protector of slavery. It is well known that abolitionism in this country has derived much of its boldness, venom, and money too, from the busy and untiring zeal of the abolitionists of Great Britain; and it may be well to recollect that a party which was powerful enough to wrest from the Government twenty-five years ago a hundred millions of dollars to purchase the freedom of the slaves in the West Indies would not now permit that Government to become the protector of slavery in the Southern States. No! Cotton is no foundation on which to erect any hope or help from Great Britain, or any fortress of civil war at home, when slavery engages in a struggle for its existence. How unwise then to trust—nay, risk—the happiness and welfare of the whole people of the South so entirely upon the success of cotton culture and the future demand for it! Those who thus risk their all upon one rope must expect to be wrecked by unfavorable blasts of fortune. Cotton may be grown elsewhere; cotton may be superseded; a popular revolution and civil war in England may ruin the market. No State in the South should be dependent on cotton alone for the necessities of life; not even for its luxuries.

If foreign influences, then, be regarded as out of the way, and the treason of disunion be considered as standing alone and trusting in its own strength, the first consideration will be, where is to be the line of separation—the boundary between North and South? It strikes me such a national boundary as that between the States with slavery and those without is an impossibility. Its vast length would render it indefensible; its peculiar course and the navigable rivers it involves would give occasion to ceaseless causes of irritation and unending war. There could be no peace with such a boundary, with slaves on one side and abolitionists on the other, and nothing but war could change it; nothing but sheer force could establish and maintain another boundary. It is well known that a *vast* majority of the Southern people are against disunion for any cause or under any circumstances, believing that they can maintain themselves, their interests, and institutions more successfully in the Union than out of it, and that they are quite as able to defend themselves where they are as others are to attack them. Supposing, however, for a moment, that this majority is for a time overcome, that disunion is accomplished, and that a popular Government is established, then will arise more reasons for disunion than before; for the questions to be settled and the work to be done will involve more serious difficulties than any legislators in this country have yet encountered. If majorities against the *de facto* Government do not speedily appear, if discord and dissatisfaction and resistance do not rapidly paralyze the arm of the new Government, it will be strange indeed. The South will

then find on the one hand abundance of the same sort of stuff in Southern Congress as that which has figured in the revolutions of Mexico and South America, and on the other very many true friends of the old state of things. With such a boundary to watch and defend and such discordant elements in its social system, the South would be in no favorable condition to protect its peculiar institution from the incessant attacks which would be directed against it, and through it against the whole country. The wise and the good would then be roused against the unwise, hot-headed men who had brought such difficulties upon them. It would soon be found that the fanatical disunionists who had caused the calamity were not the men to be trusted in times when sound judgment and firm courage were indispensable. If that day ever comes, the present race of politicians and political economists in the South will be thrust aside with equal contempt for their history and their theories.

War between the North and South! This world has never witnessed a greater calamity to human welfare. There is no true patriot, no friend of humanity, but must shudder at the idea. It is, however, evidently within the contemplation of some of those fanatics who are now fanning the flames of discord. This extremity of war belongs rather to the fanatics of the South than those of the North. They inflate themselves with the idea that Southern chivalry could readily overcome the manufacturers, mechanics, and farmers of the North. They suppose that offices and glory would be plenty, and that there would be many opportunities for immensely

distinguishing themselves. They do not realize that if a separation had taken place the real men of the South, the men who have not been seen in the mire of politics, would soon take the reins out of such unworthy and incapable hands. The South, like the North, having been long misrepresented, would be roused by the emergency; her ablest and best men would again take the lead. It is but too true that separation would be followed by war. It could not take place but under very great irritation on both sides. With hot blood to begin with and the flight of slaves to keep it up, a border warfare of the most bitter kind would immediately ensue. It costs more now to *pursue* a slave than he is worth; but in the case of war on the borders, it would cost more to *keep* slaves within a hundred miles of the boundary than they would be worth. They would soon become excited, dangerous enemies to the households of their masters, and almost impossible to retain in service. Now, when they fly, they must run hundreds of miles after they cross the slave boundary, and are still in danger of being arrested and returned: then once across the line they would be safe. No slaves would remain near the long boundary; those who did not make their escape would be sent far into the interior. The seat of this fratricidal war, originating in slavery, would soon be along a boundary where there were no slaves. Its heaviest calamities, its worst devastations on the Southern side would fall upon those who were and could be no longer slaveholders. I say nothing of the courage, endurance, or military skill of the respective parties. There is not a doubt they could do each other incalculable injury, and

that in a few years the actual cost of the war, its ravages, its interruption of industry, would be equal in value to the whole of the able-bodied slaves. The free States have double the population along the boundary that the States of the South have, and are therefore doubly as strong, without taking into account the paralyzing effect of the slave population, which would have to be watched in the rear, with a powerful enemy in front. I am willing to admit the South could never be conquered; such an effort would not probably be made, and could not be successful; but the South could and would be ruined. Any cool and reflecting mind can anticipate some of the principal results: 1. The value of slaves would sink rapidly to one-half, one-third, or a fourth of their present rate, according to their localities. On the line of the boundary they would be worth nothing except for sale in the interior; great numbers would be sent back for sale. But the value for hundreds of miles in the interior would be affected by uneasiness of the masters and increased restlessness among slaves. There would be no demand for slaves where this uneasiness extended. Slaves now quiet and peaceful, would soon become agitated by rumors of war and the movement of armies; a war they would soon learn of which they were the cause; a war they would soon learn involving their freedom or perpetual bondage; roused by the excitement of such a war, they could no longer be trusted with the lives and property of the masters. Thus roused, and roused they would be, murder and conflagration would rage far and wide. The slaves could burn up all the dwellings, and all the buildings in the South-

ern country places in one night. The Southern social system reposes upon magazines of powder, peacefully and safely it is true, and with power and facilities to increase this security. Will the South deliberately kindle a fire over these mines, and incur the hazard of inevitable explosion? After three years of war with the North, neither woman nor child would sleep in safety in all the South. That Slavery which some now defend and would extend as a blessing, would then be felt as the direct curse of humanity. It can only under any circumstances be a blessing, when it is a blessing to the slave as well as the master, and it can never be a blessing to either, but under the reign of peace and a varied industry.

2. The whole of the Southern ports would be placed under blockade. Not a bale of cotton, not a cask of rice, nor a hogshead of tobacco could be exported. I am supposing there would be no help from England, and there is no probability that there would be any. The South might purchase ships, but the South has no sailors and can have none: and even steamers require sailors. Charleston, Savannah, Mobile and New Orleans, would be completely shut out from the foreign market. The main industry of the South would be ruined. What then would be the value of slaves? Maryland would become the seat of war; slaves could not be retained in any part of that State. Baltimore would be a besieged city, and the Chesapeake would be no longer a channel of commerce, let who might hold its strong places. Baltimore would be utterly prostrated for the time, by a war between North and South. The whole Southern coast would be visited by clouds of North-

ern coasters and small steamers carrying off slaves by thousands and tens of thousands. It would be impossible to prevent this from the land side. Nearly the whole Southern coast would be open to hostile incursion. The result would be to excite and unsettle the slaves, with the results of fire and outrage. Can they be sensible men who shut their eyes to such hazards? Can they be prudent men who are driven by the mere excitement of party politics, or by petty contests about a few dozen fugitive slaves, to measures which might have such dire results?

3. With the value of slaves and the general disturbance of agricultural industry in the South, lands would fall in value from twenty to fifty per cent. and become in fact wholly unsaleable. Property in slaves becoming unsafe, undesirable and unprofitable, yielding no income, and there being in the South no field for the industry or enterprise of the white population, (and in time of war there could be no general cure for that evil,) there would be a large emigration to the North. This would occur not only from the cause just mentioned, but from the ties of kindred and a multitude of others, not the least of which would be the fear of the slaves. This emigration would throw vast quantities of land on the market, and completely destroy any selling value lands might have. I might proceed with this enumeration of calamities which disunion and war would inflict on the South; but surely ruined cities, the loss of all foreign commerce, the destruction of home industry, the loss of slaves by thousands upon thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, the demoralization of the remainder, the horrors of servile being added

to the devastation of civil war, the fall in the value of lands, in addition to that in the value of slaves, and the consequent general ruin of private fortunes, surely these are enough in contemplation to bring any but madmen to their senses. Men who, for the causes of which the South now complain, can, through want of firmness, or good sense, or patience, drag a whole population into misfortunes such as these, deserve neither wives, nor children, nor home, nor country, nor friends, nor estate.

Looking upon Slavery, as I do, as an efficient means of civilizing the African, and believing that, however short the masters in the United States have come of their duty in this respect, they have done better than others, and greatly advanced their slaves in civilization and industry, I should deplore the consequences of such a war in its results upon the slave, as well as upon the master. The almost certain result of this contest would be the entire extinction of Slavery, whereby millions of semi-civilized men would be turned loose, to the utter ruin of the white population, though unfit themselves to form a civilized community. The condition of this great mass of humanity would speedily fall below its present standard, and their progress in civilization would be indefinitely retarded. Thus war with the North would be equally ruinous to the white and colored population. The end would be the re-colonization of the Southern territory by white labor, and its reunion with the North.

If, contrary to the opinion above suggested, England should interfere by her navy to break up the Southern blockade, the almost certain result would be the



loss of her provinces north of the United States and their becoming Northern States, thus making a nation in the North of overpowering magnitude and strength, able at all times to make head against any European alliance. If no war should follow disunion, there are elements of discord in the Southern States and population which would soon make it an unhappy and undesirable residence. There would be a wide territory and no middle class. An aristocracy can never prosper in such circumstances. The leaders in the South appear now to agree and stand firmly together; but this union is solely in defence of Slavery, supposed to be threatened by the North. If this repressive influence were removed, there would be no longer two or three, but the parties in the South would be as many as the chieftains. The Southern people may respect law and venerate constitutions, but they are guided by their passions; they lack patience and calmness, and fail in the exercise of their common sense. They would be a prey to feuds and divisions. An aristocracy could govern Venice, a city, but not Poland, a country. Russia would now be a scene of internal strife but for the power of the Czar. Mexico has many enlightened, well-educated, intelligent men, but no educated, intelligent middle class. Mexico is a prey to chieftainship, and so would be our Southern States. So it was when the feudal system prevailed throughout Europe, and so it must ever be where men have a taste for power and leisure to seek for it, and where no other great interests or pursuits interfere. It is not so now in the Southern States, because for the reason already given, the Constitution of the United States, and

the power which upholds it represses the freaks of ambition and the quarrels of the ambitious.

The true policy of the South is plain to unclouded eyes. The Southern people have a great advantage in the Constitution of the United States; such an advantage as a representation for three-fifths of the colored people could not now be obtained on any terms. That is a mighty power placed in the hands of the white population of the South over the whole policy of this immense country. This vast nation is bound by it to the defence of Slavery against all the world. Slavery by itself is detested now throughout Christendom; but Slavery here is a part of the institutions of the freest and most powerful country in the world. Slavery commands respect here, and no where else. The South should stand by the Constitution while a shred of it is left. It should maintain the Union with all its power, and in the Union it has great power. All its battles should be fought in the Union, for there is its strength; out of the Union Samson is shorn of his locks. It is true the wisdom and good sense of the South in the Union has been far behind its intelligence, and indicates pretty distinctly the troubles the South would meet in the path of exclusive self-control. It has mistaken its economical policy in the Union, and has sometimes appeared to be more bent on resisting the policy of the North than on studying its own. It is time for the South to understand that, as it claims special consideration for a peculiar institution, the North has also a peculiar institution—a large mass of white laborers—for whose welfare it should be just as anxious, just as much interested as the South is for

its large mass of black laborers. The wealth of both sections depends on the proper employment of these two classes of laborers. The laborers of England and other countries, who receive far less wages, enter into direct competition with these Northern laborers; but that competition has hitherto not reached the black laborers, who have enjoyed a long monopoly. Led astray by this advantage, the South has expended its whole strength upon a few products, and, whilst enjoying this advantage, it has resisted inch by inch the policy which Northern labor demanded. In this struggle, the nation has incurred incalculable loss — loss of time, of skill, experience, money, and productive power. The parties to the struggle have borne this loss. The South was wrong, and has suffered the most. The United States might by this time have been the first manufacturing Power in the world; they possess the elements for this ascendancy. In less than thirty years the monopoly of the South will be gone, but in less than that time every pound of cotton which can be grown in the United States can be manufactured here.\* The South is now dependent on a foreign market to sell in, and wishes to be dependent on a foreign market to buy in. Can any man of common foresight fail to see that the South should provide a market for its products at home, not merely in the United States, but for as large a portion as possible at her own door? In no way could Southern money be better expended than

---

\* Great Britain now receives one-quarter of her supply of cotton from other countries, and one-fifth of the whole from India. This is a rapid progress in cotton culture. The quantity received from India in 1854 was 1,619,058 cwts., or 404,764 bales.

on premiums on cotton goods manufactured in the South. Cotton ropes, cotton bagging, cotton duck, and drillings, negro clothing, and all heavy cotton goods, should be largely, if not wholly, manufactured at the South. Let not the men who enter this career suffer for want of encouragement or capital. They are the true friends of the South. Let not the students of professorial political economy be heard or heeded against this plain dictate of common sense. The South may find it as profitable to sell cotton at home as in England, and more profitable to feed manufacturing laborers than to plant cotton. There is no profit made on land equal to that made by feeding men who are close beside the farm.

But, whatever may be said of the past, the indications are clear that the South should change its policy, and vary its industry, and be as little as possible at the mercy of the enemies of slavery, and especially of England, the capital and enterprise of which is now ransacking the earth to find territory on which to grow cotton and be rid of this product of slave-labor. England is on the alert looking far ahead for more cotton. The political economy of the South takes no note of this, but persists in thinking and acting as if cotton could only be well sold in England, and as if the market there could never fail nor be cut off. England is so unwilling to be dependent upon a single country for the chief supply of a raw material so important, that she favors the culture of cotton wherever there is possibility of success. The corresponding policy of the South should be to stimulate the manufacture of cotton in every part of the world, so as not to be dependent on England. But,

no; the South has favored with all its might a policy fatal to all but English manufacturers, and has evinced particular aversion to the cotton manufactures of their own country. But the manufactures of the North, under all the opposition and unfriendly regards of the South, are now a vastly more important productive power than the negro labor of the South. The income of the North for each head of the population is vastly greater than that of the South; the trade of the North is far the greatest; the cities are the largest; the land is worth two or three times as much by the acre, and increasing in value while that of the South is going down. The wealth, power, and productive force of the North surpasses that of the South immensely. It is the division of labor, the division of employment, it is the blended agricultural and manufacturing industry which has done this. The North has been working for its own people, while the South, like Portugal and Ireland, has been working for England. Both these countries have had full enjoyment of the cheap goods of England, and Ireland, recently more than decimated by famine, has enjoyed them without a penny of duty.

The North has the name all over the world of knowing how to make money; but the South specially fails in commercial and industrial acuteness. Let the South now begin to study its own interests, not in the light of Say's Political Economy, but in the light of common sense and upon the facts as they exist. Let the next Southern Convention drop the subject of commerce, and take up that of industry, which comes before commerce; let it be considered how Southern labor can be made more productive by vary-

ing its operations; how it can be made more self-dependent and less sensitive to foreign influences; what can be done in that way by individual association, and especially what must be done for that end by the various Legislatures. Let not the Convention fear those who quote Say or Smith. The meeting of these Southern Commercial Conventions is such a violation of their doctrines, that no hesitation need be felt at further rebellion. Let the whole Southern policy be studied and worked out; then come with it to Congress, prepared to give as well as to take; ready to make those compromises which are as needful in the progress and policy of our great country as in its original Constitution.

Whilst the South has been fretting and fuming about some scores of fugitive slaves, worth a few thousands, it has, by its mistaken industrial policy, lost millions on millions. It is time this subject was reconsidered. The South has suffered; but why let all the grief and all the wrath take the direction of the fugitive slaves? If the North had encountered such an annoyance, it would have met it at once by an insurance company, and turned over the whole business of pursuing fugitive slaves to the agents of a corporation. But, no! the wisdom of the South is of that kind which Burke described, when speaking of the determination of England to subdue her rebellious colonies. He said it reminded him of the man in the fable who would shear a wolf. He had a right to shear it; and shear it he would, although he got bristles in place of wool, and lost his life in the attempt.

Before I close this very long communication per-

mit me to say again, that I have no words to express my estimate of the folly—and, I may add, the danger—of this cry of disunion from the South. I had hoped that Slavery would be permitted to accomplish peaceably and effectually its great mission of civilizing and training to industry the millions of Africans now in the Southern States, and that the unhappy agitation which exists on the subject of Slavery would subside into mere exhortations to the masters to fulfil their duty to the slaves, or into grave enlightened discussions of what that is and how it should be performed. I had hoped that it would never be disputed, on the one hand, that the African must pay for his education by his personal services, and that he must submit to that personal discipline necessary for his training to civilized life; and that this discipline and training must be continued until the African had undergone the physical, moral, and intellectual change which would fit him to take his place among civilized nations, and to become the agent for a like process in Africa. I had hoped, on the other hand, that no other doctrine of Slavery would be propounded or defended in the South. But what do we hear now from that quarter? The views of Slavery entertained by all the good and great men of the South down to thirty years ago are scornfully repudiated. The South, or rather those who presume to speak for the South, now avows itself the friend of Slavery on purely money-making or industrial principles, making it such a question as that between horses and mules, or between machinery and manual labor. The man is utterly lost sight of in recent demonstrations on the subject of Slavery.

The African is in theory consigned to endless bondage; the idea of his gradual improvement seems to be abandoned. The doctrines of Slavery, as now avowed by many who profess to speak the sentiments of the South, are the most offensive which can be conceived. They are an offence to the civilized world, and if continued will cut off all sympathy between the South and the civilized world. The day may come when these doctrines will be quoted with fearful effect against the South. If we can credit these men who affect to represent Southern feeling, the South is now a great *slavery propaganda*, which would spread that institution not only over all the unoccupied territory of the United States, but, if possible, over the free States and throughout the world, asserting that the form of society now existing there, including Slavery, is a model for all the world, and that society, as it exists elsewhere and without Slavery, is a failure. Admitting all the faults and failings existing in society without Slavery, this is an unpardonably exaggerated position. It exhibits an excitement, if not an aberration of mind not merely inexcusable, but dangerous. If such doctrines continue to be propounded in the South; if they penetrate the minds of the whole people; if such doctrines find their way into the legislation and the whole public policy and literature of the South, then, for one, I shall give up all hope of the true mission of Slavery ever being fulfilled there. I shall look for an early and violent end of the institution in the United States, and for the utter ruin and prostration of that society which upholds Slavery as a normal industrial institution. The South cannot



assume, hold, and act upon that principle without an undying quarrel with the North and with the whole civilized world. In that quarrel Slavery would soon not merely succumb, but revenge itself signally upon those who could so pervert its real uses and shut their eyes to its proper termination. With the free, rich, and populous States, including Canada on the north and the free States of Mexico on the south, with every nation in Christendom in opposition to Slavery as they profess it, what would become of the South? If the South has cause of irritation now and is unable to subside into any thing like repose, what will be the condition of things when all the enemies of Slavery are unchained? In that day no man, white or black, can travel in all the extent of the South unquestioned; and a police as rigid as that which now watches over Paris will extend its eyes and *arms* not merely over the cities, but throughout the country. No man, white or black, can go where he is unknown without passport and letters. The press will be muzzled, men's mouths will be muzzled, and military despotism will reign where any thing reigns but anarchy.

If this experiment of African Slavery in the United States comes to this unhappy end, it will unquestionably be the work of the slaveholders, and it will then be concluded that they were doomed to this madness as the precursor of destruction to them and their peculiar institution. How unhappy all this! What human woe and misery would be involved in the utter ruin of the South! How, then, would the whole race of abolitionists rejoice in what they would regard as the just judgment of Heaven!

The truth is, our entire country has fallen into the hands of politicians, whose whole thoughts are bent upon getting into office and remaining in office. Our Legislatures, State and National, are filled with men wholly unfit for their position, men too much bent upon their private interests to think of public concerns, and incapable, even if patriotic, of serving the public with honor to themselves or advantage to the people. Whatever the special demerits of these unscrupulous politicians, there is one of their practices peculiarly baneful to the country. They seize upon all the excitements, anxieties, desires of the people, and upon all their great leading interests, upon all sectional differences, and turn them into electioneering topics; they inflame every excitement, deepen every anxiety, exaggerate every desire, magnify or depress, as suits them, the importance of every public interest; they widen every difference; they put themselves forward as the champions of every cause, and make the impression that their advocacy or opposition is indispensable. Whatever the difference, the politicians of both North and South are given to this detestable practice. While some are blowing up the excitements of abolitionism in the North, others are playing upon the natural sensitiveness in the South on the subject of Slavery. This game has been played in the South until the whole country is ready to burst into a flame. How far this apparently fierce excitement does really reach the intelligent and virtuous people of the South, it is difficult to say; but there is reason to apprehend that it has reached a dangerous extent. It has been fanned and fed with an industry very likely to beget

such results. The dose of exaggeration, dire alarm, and fiery indignation, yearly administered to the nervous system of the people of the South, has been with each occasion increased until the paroxysm is imminent. What do these men care? If disunion follow, there must still be offices and power and salaries, all accessible by the same practices.

The kind of emancipation now most needed at the South is from the thralldom of this excitement and the official agency of these bad or rash men. It is also needed at the North; but the hazards of the game are widely different in the two sections. Let the calm, the prudent, and wise men of the South betake themselves to consideration; let them thrust from their presence every man of noise, every excitement-monger, every disunionist. Let the South think no more of conquering new States and adding more territory, but rather think of consolidating, enriching, and defending the wide domain already conquered. The policy of pursuing new conquests puts the whole in hazard.

It should be noted that all the value added by the labor of slaves to new territory is taken from the lands whence they are drawn. For every new plantation stocked with slaves, an old one is sold. The effect of a great emigration of slaves is a mighty depreciation of the lands which they leave. This may not be visible immediately, but the effect is inevitable. Yet such is the mania for *slave power*, that this impoverishing process is either not perceived or disregarded. This mighty effort to extend Slavery for the sake of political power, strikes me painfully in reference to Southern character. Many

regard every thing as fair in politics; but, apart from that, there certainly does appear to be something mean and unworthy of the noble character which the people of the South have borne in times past, in this incessant effort to extend the area of Slavery for the sake of political power. It cannot be any protection to Slavery; for power gained at the expense of a good understanding with the North cannot be any protection; it is peril. The Constitution of the United States and its friends are the real protection of Slavery. The alienation of those friends is a work to which some men in the South seem now seriously devoted, the disastrous effects of which no slave power can avert.

The subject of fugitive slaves, in presence of these more important considerations, is of small consequence. Take care of the millions, and there will be less trouble about the scores; but take care of them at any rate, for they are in danger, and that danger involves perils so great that those who would encounter them without just cause cannot be warned in terms too strong.

These evils are not without remedy. Let wise and prudent men of the North and South take up at once the whole of their sectional differences. A convention of a score from each side, not being politicians or candidates for any office, assembled to consult upon the interests of the whole country, could in a fortnight or two devise a system of policy touching these differences and the great interests of the country, the adoption of which could be secured; and, whilst tranquillity and progress would be assured at home, the moral power of the country

throughout the world, now seriously impaired and diminished, would be restored. Under such a policy the career of this country in arts, in industry, in power, and it might be hoped in justice and moderation, would far exceed any anticipations ever yet formed.